

Amendment dated 2/25/2005  
Response to Office Action mailed 11/26/2004 and  
Advisory Action mailed 02/11/2005

Application No. 09/456,150

### **REMARKS**

The Final Office Action of November 26, 2004 and the Advisory Office Action of February 11, 2005 have been reviewed and the comments therein were carefully considered. Claims 1-32 are currently pending, and claims 1-32 stand rejected. Claims 5, 7, 9-10, 17-18, 20-21, and 26 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 1, 6, 8, 12, 19, 23, 25, and 32 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced into the application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application and allowance of all remaining claims.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-9, 11-20, 22-29, and 31-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Stoub*, U.S. Pat. No 6,389,437 B2 filed on 01/1998 (hereinafter "*Stoub*"). Applicants have canceled claims 5, 7, 9, 17, 18, 20, and 26, thereby rendering these rejections moot. As to the remaining claims, Applicants respectfully traverse.

With respect to claim 1, the office action alleges that *Stoub* discloses each feature of the claimed invention. Claim 1 as amended recites:

In a computer-based device, a method for formatting a document for presentation on a display of the computer-based device, wherein format of the document is controlled by a plurality of formatting variables, the method comprising steps of:

a) receiving user data specifying a value for at least one user-modifiable formatting variable of the plurality of formatting variables the at least one user-modifiable formatting variable including a font reference variable; and

b) in response to step a) modifying at least a portion of the plurality of formatting variables, other than the variable specified in a), such that the modified variables are optimized for readability;

wherein the value specified by the user data for the user-modifiable formatting variable comprises a non-numeric large setting and a non-numeric small setting.

Amendment dated 2/25/2005  
Response to Office Action mailed 11/26/2004 and  
Advisory Action mailed 02/11/2005

Application No. 09/456,150

Applicants submit that *Stoub* fails to teach or suggest a "user-modifiable formatting variable including a font reference variable ... wherein the value specified by the user data for the user-modifiable formatting variable comprises a non-numeric large setting and a non-numeric small setting" as recited in the amended claim. The office action alleges that *Stoub* teaches a font reference variable in the form of a user-selected font such as Times New Roman (see rejections of claims 5 and 17 in Office Action). A mere user-selected font does not constitute a font reference variable and even if it were, *Stoub* does not teach a font reference variable whereby the values specified for the font reference variable include a non-numeric large setting and a non-numeric small setting. At most, *Stoub* discloses a numeric large setting in the form of a font size such as 12 or 14. However, the method disclosed in *Stoub* does not provide the simplicity afforded by the present invention which allows the user to select a large setting or a small setting without needing to know or understand the detail of numeric font sizes. Thus, claim 1 is allowable over *Stoub*. Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 8 and 11 each depend from claim 1 and are allowable as being dependent on an allowable base claim and further in view of the remarks below.

With respect to claim 6, the office action alleges that *Stoub* discloses at column 4, lines 31-32 selectively enlarging information printed in small fonts. The office action further argues that at column 6, lines 1-13 and 21-27, *Stoub* teaches allowing the user to selectively increase the size of the font (user-modifiable formatting variable) such as 12 or 14 point type or other desirable font size (value for user-modifiable formatting variable).

Claim 6 as amended recites:

The method of claim 1, wherein the value specified by the user data for the font reference variable comprises either a font value of "Large" and a font value of "Small".

Amendment dated 2/25/2005  
Response to Office Action mailed 11/26/2004 and  
Advisory Action mailed 02/11/2005

Application No. 09/456,150

Applicants respectfully submit that *Stoub* does not teach or suggest a font value of "Large" and a font value of "Small" as recited in the claim. At most, *Stoub* shows selecting a font size value in the form of a number (e.g. 12, 14, etc.), but does not disclose a value of "Large" or "Small" for the font reference variable as recited in claim 6. Accordingly, claim 6 is allowable over *Stoub*.

With respect to claim 8, the office action alleges that *Stoub* teaches font size and a font such as Times New Roman at column 6, lines 1-13. The office action further contends that at column 7, lines 11-15 and at column 9, lines 26-42, *Stoub* teaches paragraph indent and hyphenating words.

Claim 8 as amended recites:

The method of claim 1, wherein the plurality of formatting variables comprises any of a serif variable, a leading variable, a justification variable and a language variable,

*Stoub* fails to teach or suggest any of a serif variable, a leading variable, a justification variable, and a language variable as recited in claim 8. As a result, claim 8 is allowable over *Stoub*.

With respect to claim 11, the office action alleges that *Stoub* teaches at column 6, lines 21-27 using an up arrow button for increasing font size and using a down arrow for decreasing font size. Claim 11 recites: "The method of claim 8, wherein a value for the leading variable optimized for readability comprises any value within a range of 10 to 20 percent."

"Leading" as described in the instant specification at page 12, lines 10-13 refers to "a percentage of the font size and indicates the amount of vertical space upon which the font is displayed. For example, a 10-point font displayed upon a 12-point space corresponds to 120% leading. However, a 120% leading setting applied to 14-point font leads to a vertical space of 16.8 points." Thus, although a leading variable can be related to font size, it is clearly not the same as font size as alleged in the office action. *Stoub* describes no leading variable. As a result, claim 11 is allowable over *Stoub*.

Amendment dated 2/25/2005  
Response to Office Action mailed 11/26/2004 and  
Advisory Action mailed 02/11/2005

Application No. 09/456,150

With respect to claim 12, the office action rejected the claim on substantially the same grounds as the rejection of claim 1. Claim 12 as amended recites:

An apparatus comprising:

- a processor;
- a display coupled to the processor;
- a user interface selection device coupled to the processor; and
- a storage device, coupled to the processor, comprising instructions, executable by the processor, for performing steps of:
  - a) receiving user data, via the user interface selection device, specifying a value for at least one user-modifiable formatting variable of a plurality of formatting variables used to control format of a document for display, the at least one user-modifiable formatting variable including a display form factor variable; and
  - b) in response to step a) modifying at least a portion of the plurality of formatting variables, other than the variable specified in a), such that the modified variables are optimized for readability; wherein the value specified by the user data for the display form factor variable comprises one of a plurality of screen resolution settings.

Applicants submit that *Stoub* fails to teach or suggest each of the features in claim 12 as amended. Namely, *Stoub* does not disclose, teach, or suggest "at least one user-modifiable formatting variable including a display form factor variable ... wherein the value specified by the user data for the display form factor variable comprises one of a plurality of screen resolution settings" as recited in the amended claim.

The office action alleges that *Stoub* teaches a display form factor variable by disclosing changing the size of a displayed font (see rejections of claims 7 and 27 in Office Action). However, a display form factor wherein the value comprises one of a plurality of screen resolution settings is not present in *Stoub*. In fact, *Stoub* makes no mention of screen resolution. In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 12 is allowable. Claims 13-16, 19 and 22 each depend from claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 12. Moreover,

Amendment dated 2/25/2005  
Response to Office Action mailed 11/26/2004 and  
Advisory Action mailed 02/11/2005

Application No. 09/456,150

claims 19 and 22 are substantially similar to claims 8 and 11 and are further allowable for the reasons discussed in connection with these claims above.

With respect to claim 23, the office action alleges that *Stoub* discloses each feature recited in the claim. Claim 23 as amended recites:

An apparatus comprising:

a processor;

a handheld display coupled to the processor; and

a storage device, coupled to the processor, comprising instructions, executable by the processor, for performing steps of:

a) receiving a value of a display form factor variable indicative of display characteristics of the display; and

b) in response to step a) modifying at least a portion of a plurality of formatting variables, other than the display form factor variable specified in a), such that the modified variables are optimized for readability.

Applicants submit that *Stoub* fails to disclose, teach, or suggest at least "a handheld display coupled to a processor" as recited in the amended claim. The office action alleges that *Stoub* teaches a laptop device at column 3, lines 26-27 and further teaches any other type of monitor at column 5, lines 46-53. Applicants submit that neither the laptop computer nor "any other type of monitor" constitute a handheld display as recited in the claim. Moreover, a handheld display is not a monitor. Thus, *Stoub*'s teaching of "any other type of monitor" does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed feature of a handheld display. As a result, Applicants submit that claim 23 is allowable over *Stoub*. Claims 24, 25, 29-31 ultimately depend from claim 23 and are allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 23.

Moreover, with respect to claim 25, the office action alleges that *Stoub* teaches a handheld display. Claim 25 recites: "The apparatus of claim 24, wherein the handheld display has a resolution

Amendment dated 2/25/2005  
Response to Office Action mailed 11/26/2004 and  
Advisory Action mailed 02/11/2005

Application No. 09/456,150

of 240 pixels by 320 pixels.” *Stoub* fails to disclose a handheld display with a resolution of 240 pixels by 320 pixels as recited in the amended claim. Accordingly, claim 25 is allowable over *Stoub*.

With respect to claim 27, the office action alleges that *Stoub* discloses a display form factor variable at column 4, lines 31-39, where it discloses changing the size of a displayed font. Claim 27 recites: “The apparatus of claim 23, wherein the value of the display form factor variable indicates a resolution of the display.” *Stoub* does not disclose, teach, or suggest a resolution of the display as recited in claim 27. The resolution of a display is indicative of the number of pixels placed on the display, not of the size of the text displayed on the display. Thus, claim 27 is allowable over *Stoub*.

With respect to claim 32, the office action alleges that *Stoub* teaches each feature recited in the claim. Claim 32 as amended recites:

A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising:

a plurality of formatting variables for use in formatting a document for display via a computer-based display, the plurality of formatting variables comprising at least one user-modifiable formatting variable and a screen resolution variable; and

optimized formatting values corresponding to at least a portion of the plurality of formatting variables,

wherein the portion of the plurality of formatting variables is modified, other than the at least one user-modifiable formatting variable, based on user specified data for the at least one user modifiable formatting variable, and further based on the screen resolution variable such that the modified variables are optimized for readability.

Applicants submit that *Stoub* does not teach or suggest a “user-modifiable formatting variable and a screen resolution variable ... wherein the plurality of formatting variables is modified ... based on user specified data for the at least one user modifiable formatting variable and further based on the screen resolution variable” as recited in the claim.

Amendment dated 2/25/2005  
Response to Office Action mailed 11/26/2004 and  
Advisory Action mailed 02/11/2005

Application No. 09/456,150

*Stoub* does not teach basing changes to formatting variables on the screen resolution as recited in the amended claim. As a result, claim 32 is allowable over *Stoub*.


**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 10, 21, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Stoub*, as applied to claims 1-9, 11-20, 22-29, and 21-32, in view of *Chang et al.*, U.S. Pat. No. 6,584,479 filed on 06/1998 (hereinafter "*Chang*"). Claims 10 and 21 have been canceled by Applicants, thereby rendering their rejections moot. With respect to claim 30, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 30 is allowable for at least the same reason as independent claim 23 from which it ultimately depends.

In view of the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that the remaining claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all remaining claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe that a conversation with the Applicant's representative would be useful in the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to call the Applicant's representative.

Dated: February 25, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

  
William J. Allen  
Registration No. 51,393  
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.  
Ten South Wacker Drive  
Suite 3000  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: 312-463-5000  
Facsimile: 312-463-5001